

Ontario Law Society to make lawyers take mandatory six-hour indigenous training

Ontario lawyers must now complete six hours of mandatory Indigenous training, featuring land acknowledgements, lessons on colonization, and seven modules on pre-colonial religious beliefs.

CLAYTON DEMAINE

MAR 01, 2026 • PAID



7



6



1

Share



Source: Adobe Stock

Ontario lawyers must now complete six hours of mandatory Indigenous training, featuring land acknowledgements, lessons on colonization, and seven modules on pre-colonial religious beliefs, just to keep their professional licenses.

The Law Society of Ontario's "Equity and Indigenous Affairs Committee" has approved mandatory "Indigenous cultural training" for all of its more than 61,000 members. The training will count toward the ethics training they are already required to take, meaning the Indigenous ideology seminars will replace other potentially relevant ethics education for lawyers seeking to receive or maintain their licence.

You won't find stories like this in legacy media. Become a Juno News premium subscriber today to support bold, independent journalism.

 **byrna** LESS-LETHAL | THE ALTERNATIVE TO DEADLY FORCE

The Law Society of Ontario (LSO) announced the plan Thursday, which has angered many Ontario lawyers and Canadians who view the move as another example of a regulatory body abandoning its mandate in favour of pushing left-wing ideological agenda.

The committee's report notes that the regulator voted 26 to 23, with two abstaining, in favour of adopting the mandatory Indigenous training module.

The report outlines that most individual submissions from law society members were against imposing the re-education program, though a majority of unnamed "organizations" supported the plan.

“The majority of organizations, particularly legal clinics, advocacy groups, Indigenous organizations, and some professional associations supported mandatory training and identified it as consistent with professional obligations arising from the TRC’s Call to Action 27,” the report states. “Individual submissions, particularly from lawyers, were more divided. A majority opposed mandating the Course, citing concerns related to relevance to practice, regulatory overreach, and administrative burden.”



The report stated “a significant minority” of individuals submitting to the committee supported the requirement. The report does not mention what percentage of individuals and organizations expressed support or opposition to the new requirement.

Lisa Bilty, executive director of the Free Speech Union of Canada and a litigator at Libertas law, who has a record of defending the rights of individuals protesting COVID-era crackdowns, was on the committee and shared on X that she voted against imposing the requirement.



She hinted that the course would be filled with falsehoods and ideology rather than just facts about Indigenous people and their history in Canada, though noted she could not say much more until the full program had been officially released to the public.

In response to the motion, several defenders of civil liberties in Canada opposed the motion, including Josh Dehaas, a litigator with the Canadian Constitution Foundation. The Justice Centre for Constitutional Freedoms started an online petition campaign on its website calling the act “politicization, compelled speech” and “ideological enforcement.”

One civil liberties advocate, Daniel Ari Freiheit, shared his concerns that the training would result in a compelled declaration from lawyers that they

support the ideology pushed by the training course, much like they already are required to do annually with a Human Rights Acknowledgement.

**Lion Advocacy** 
@LionAdvocacy

 

While you're at it, don't forget to mention that if Ontario lawyers/paralegals don't annually click yes to this acknowledgement, they could face suspension.
It's true there are hundreds of Rules of Professional Conduct. But only this one requires an annual button click.

2 Human Rights Acknowledgement

Rule 6.3.1-1 of the Rules of Professional Conduct says "a lawyer has a special responsibility to respect the requirements of human rights laws in force in Ontario and, specifically, to honour the obligation not to discriminate on the grounds of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age, record of offences (as defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code), marital status, family status, or disability with respect to professional employment of other lawyers, articulated students, or any other person or in professional dealings with other licensees or any other person."

I acknowledge ☐ Yes ☐ No

7:34 PM · Feb 26, 2026 · **1,614** Views

 2  16  75  8 

At the time the requirement for lawyers to pledge support for diversity, equity and inclusion in the form of a “Statement of Principles” (SOP) came into play in 2017-2018, many voting licensees backed StopSOP candidates who were opposed to compelled speech.

Litigants also challenged the constitutionality of the SOP. While litigation was underway, the LSO still required members to check that they agreed with the ideology of the SOP, despite many objections, out of fear of losing their jobs.

StopSOP won a majority of lawyer bench seats in 2019. However, repealing the SOP required Convocation votes across the regulator's full governing structure. Ultimately, the Human Rights Acknowledgement came into effect as a compromise, as it represented what was already law in the Human Rights Code.



7 Likes • 1 Restack

[← Previous](#)

[Next →](#)

Discussion about this post

Comments

Restacks



Write a comment...



William Stewart  William's Substack 2d Edited

AYFKM!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Time to throw up now.. Hopefully on the woke jokes who now apparently infest OntArWeOwe' Society.

This BS seems to be a trend with the various "arm's length" societies who supposedly regulate various professions (Reminder.. See Jordan Peterson).

Can the Ontario Law Society be disbarred?

Think about this ...

For the most part lawyers are appointed as judges for life. The more senior the lawyer the bet likelihood of that happening. Worse think about who is currently the Premier of OntArWeOwe would be instrumental in these appointments.

One might assume that a fair number of the woke jokes at OntArWeOwe's Law Society are on more "senior" side of things and have been front and centre in making this ridiculous and insu decision.

For what could possibly go wrong... Refer you to BC.

Also consider ... Many of these fools become Politicians. For what could possibly go wrong wi one simply look around.

... SO Will ,as happened before with the DEI BS, saner heads prevail??

Perhaps best no to hold your breath on this one.

♡ LIKE (7) 💬 REPLY



James Turner James Turner 2d

As if we needed it

Yet another example from our mindless, petty political overseers attempting to justify their existence and their criminally overblown compensation,

They are trying, again, to legislate morality by introducing one more worthless and unnecessa bureaucratic process.

This, from a sub-species of the human experiment with not so much as a passing familiarity v word 'morality'. Politicians have no understanding of the basic concept of morality.

Again ... You Can Not Legislate Morality. History has proven, time and time again, that it cannot be done.

Meanwhile, the true moral decline of the country continues, in every sector of our society, unabated, due to the depredations of our Confederacy of Dunces.

What is the end to all this social re-engineering? Will we become a society that is afraid to sp

Afraid to express an opinion? Afraid to move? Afraid to grow? Afraid to communicate?

Simply afraid?

♡ LIKE (6) 💬 REPLY



4 more comments...

